

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-23, 26, and 35-38 are under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated U.S. Patent No. 7,228,492 B1 (*Graham*). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Graham* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,692 (*Eick*).

The Examiner's rejection is fully traversed below. Nevertheless, solely to expedite prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate claim 3 and the subject matter regarded as the invention has been further clarified.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Graham* teaches: displaying of a scroll bar such that each one of a plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicates the relative importance of a plurality of locations in the file with respect to one another (Final Office Action, pages 3-4, citing col. 4, lines 24-43 and figure 1A of *Graham*).

It is noted that *Graham* states:

Annotation contour 101 can show the concentration, or persistence, of annotations throughout an entire document, or in portions of the document. Annotation contours can assist users viewing long documents. While annotation contour 101 comprises a line graph format, those of ordinary skill in the art can readily appreciate that other presentation formats, such as bar charts, scatter plots and the like can also be used without departing from the scope or the present invention. Annotation contour 101 comprises a page pointer 102 that can be dragged to a location on a graphical representation of the document contents 104 by the user using a pointing device, such as a mouse, for example. Responsive to the user's positioning the page pointer to a position in the graphical document representation, the display screen will reposition to display a corresponding location within the document. In this manner, the user can evaluate where the concentration of a concept of interest is within the document and move to this position within the document by sliding the page pointer to a corresponding location on the graphical representation of the document. [Graham, col. 4, lines 24-43]

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the annotation contour 101 of *Graham* is not a scroll bar with a plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicating the relative importance of locations of a file within the context of the claimed invention. In other words, although the page pointer 102 of *Graham* can be dragged to a location on a graphical representation of the document content 104, the page pointer 102 does not in itself indicate the relative importance of the locations of the file. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* does not teach or suggest this claimed feature, and claim 1 and other independent claims are therefore patentable over *Graham*.

In fact, *Graham* clearly teaches using a combination of a scroll bar (704) and a page pointer (714) in a contour of annotation as depicted in Figure 7A. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* teaches away from a scroll bar that in itself can indicate the relative importance of locations of a document. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* cannot possibly be combined with another reference to teach the feature recited in claim 1.

It should be noted that claim 1 recites features that render it patentable over the cited art for additional reasons. For example, claim 1 recites that the scroll bar includes a plurality of horizontal segments indicating the relative importance of content of a file.

It is noted that *Eick* teaches a scroll bar (1311) with horizontal line representations (or text lines 517). However, it is respectfully submitted that *Eick* does not teach or suggest: horizontal segments indicating the relative importance of content.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does not teach or suggest this claimed feature and claim 1 is therefore patentable over the cited art for this additional reason.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504481 (Order No. APL1P301). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/RMahboubian/  
Ramin Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 1687  
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687  
408-255-8001